arXiv:1602.01361v1 [math.RT] 3 Feb 2016

COMPLEXITY OF SIMPLE MODULES OVER THE LIE SUPERALGEBRA $\mathfrak{osp}(k|2)$

HOUSSEIN EL TURKEY

Abstract. The complexity of a module is the rate of growth of the minimal projective resolution of the module while the z-complexity is the rate of growth of the number of indecomposable summands at each step in the resolution. Let $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{osp}(k|2)$ $(k > 2)$ be the type II orthosymplectic Lie superalgebra of types B or D. In this paper, we compute the complexity and the z-complexity of the simple finite-dimensional $\mathfrak{g}$-supermodules. We then give geometric interpretations using support and associated varieties for these complexities.

1. Introduction

The complexity of a module over a finite group was first introduced by Alperin [1]. The complexity of a module (cf. Subsection 2.2) is the rate of growth of a minimal projective resolution of the module. In [2], Carlson introduced support varieties of modules over group algebras. These varieties were then used to give a geometric interpretation of the complexity. In particular, the dimension of the support variety of the module is equal to the complexity.

This work was extended to Lie superalgebras in [3] where the authors computed the complexity of the simple and Kac modules over the general linear Lie superalgebra $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{gl}(m|n)$ of type A. Their work was carried in the category of finite-dimensional $\mathfrak{g}$-supermodules which are completely reducible over the even part $\mathfrak{g}_{\bar{0}}$. Let $\mathcal{F}$ denote this category. The authors in [4] showed that, for any basic classical Lie superalgebra $\mathfrak{g}$, $\mathcal{F}$ has enough projective modules and it satisfies: (i) it is a self-injective category and (ii) every module in this category admits a projective resolution which has a polynomial rate of growth. For a module $M \in \mathcal{F}$, let $c_{\mathcal{F}}(M)$ denote the complexity of M. It was shown in [4, Theorem 2.5.1] that the complexity is always finite in classical Lie superalgebras. In addition, the complexity of a module measures how far the module is from being projective. For example, by [4, Corollary 2.7.1], $c_{\mathcal{F}}(M) = 0$ if and only if M is projective.

In addition to computing the complexity of simple and Kac modules over $\mathfrak{gl}(m|n)$ in [3], the authors interpreted their computations geometrically using two types of varieties. Explicitly, if $\mathcal{X}_M$ denotes the associated variety defined by Duflo and Serganova [7], and $\mathcal{V}_{(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{g}_{\bar{0}})}(M)$ is the support variety as defined in [6], then:

$$c_{\mathcal{F}}(X(\lambda)) = \dim \mathcal{X}_{X(\lambda)} + \dim \mathcal{V}_{(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{g}_{\bar{0}})}(X(\lambda)), \tag{1.0.1}$$

where $X(\lambda)$ is a Kac or a simple module.

In [16], the author computed the complexity of the simple and the Kac modules over the orthosymplectic Lie superalgebra $\mathfrak{osp}(2|2n)$ of type C. These computations were interpreted

Date: February 4, 2016.

geometrically as in (1.0.1). It is important to note that both types A and C are type I Lie superalgebras and hence similar results were expected. However, it was shown in [16] that simple modules satisfy (1.0.1) for the type II Lie superalgebras: $\mathfrak{osp}(3|2)$, and the three exceptional ones $D(2,1;\alpha)$, $G(3)$, and $F(4)$.

In this paper we compute the complexity of the simple modules over the orthosymplectic Lie superalgebras $\mathfrak{osp}(k|2)$ $(k>2)$ of types B and D. We show in Theorem 3.0.3 that the complexity of the atypical (cf. Subsection 2.6) simple modules is $k+1$. Then we verify that (1.0.1) holds in both types.

Moreover, we compute the z-complexity of simple modules over $\mathfrak{osp}(k|2)$ $(k>2)$. The z-complexity of modules was introduced in [3, Section 9] and will be denoted by $z_{\mathcal{F}}(-)$. In [3] the authors computed this categorical invariant for the simple and the Kac modules over $\mathfrak{gl}(m|n)$ and then used a detecting subsuperalgebra $\mathfrak{f}$ to interpret their computations geometrically. The same was done for the Lie superalgebras $\mathfrak{osp}(2|2n)$, $\mathfrak{osp}(3|2)$, $D(2,1;\alpha)$, $G(3)$, and $F(4)$ in [16]. We carry these computations over $\mathfrak{osp}(k|2)$ and conclude in Theorem 4.0.8 that if $L(\lambda)$ is a simple module, we have:

$$z_{\mathcal{F}}(L(\lambda)) = \dim \mathcal{V}_{(\mathfrak{f},\mathfrak{f}_{\bar{0}})}(L(\lambda)). \tag{1.0.2}$$

The organization of the paper goes as follows. In Section 2, we give brief preliminaries for classical Lie superalgebras and their representations. We also provide brief definitions for the complexity, support and associated variety, and z-complexity of modules. In Section 3, we compute the complexity of the simple modules over $\mathfrak{osp}(k|2)$ for $k>2$ and then relate the support and associated variety of these modules to the complexity as mentioned earlier. In Section 4, we compute the z-complexity of the same family of modules and show that it will be the same as the dimension of the support variety of a detecting subalgebra, $\mathfrak{f}$, of $\mathfrak{osp}(k|2)$.

1.1. **Acknowledgments.** I would like to acknowledge my Ph.D. adviser, Jonathan Kujawa, for his insightful comments. They were very helpful throughout this work.

2. Preliminaries

In this section we present some preliminary material on Lie superalgebras. We also give brief definitions for the complexity, z-complexity, support and associated varieties. Then we shift our focus to the Lie superalgebra $\mathfrak{osp}(k|2)$ and we provide a set of technical tools that will be used to compute the complexity.

2.1. **Lie superalgebras and representations.** We will mainly use the same notations and conventions from [16] and [17]. We will work over the complex numbers $\mathbb{C}$ throughout this paper.

A *Lie superalgebra* $\mathfrak{g}$ is $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded vector space $\mathfrak{g}=\mathfrak{g}_{\bar{0}}\oplus\mathfrak{g}_{\bar{1}}$ with a bracket operation $[\,,\,]:\mathfrak{g}\otimes\mathfrak{g}\to\mathfrak{g}$ which preserves the $\mathbb{Z}_2$-grading and satisfies graded versions of the usual Lie bracket axioms. The subspace $\mathfrak{g}_{\bar{0}}$ is a Lie algebra under the bracket and $\mathfrak{g}_{\bar{1}}$ is a $\mathfrak{g}_{\bar{0}}$-module. If $\mathfrak{g}$ has a $\mathbb{Z}$-grading given by $\mathfrak{g}=\mathfrak{g}_{-1}\oplus\mathfrak{g}_0\oplus\mathfrak{g}_1$ and compatible with the $\mathbb{Z}_2$-grading, then $\mathfrak{g}$ is a *type I* Lie superalgebra; otherwise, it is of *type II*. If there is a connected reductive algebraic group $G_{\bar{0}}$ such that $\mathrm{Lie}(G_{\bar{0}})=\mathfrak{g}_{\bar{0}}$, and an action of $G_{\bar{0}}$ on $\mathfrak{g}_{\bar{0}}$ which differentiates to the adjoint action of $\mathfrak{g}_{\bar{0}}$ on $\mathfrak{g}_{\bar{1}}$, then $\mathfrak{g}$ is called *classical*. Moreover, if it has a nondegenerate

invariant supersymmetric even bilinear form, then fg is called *basic*. For our purposes, the Lie superalgebra $\mathfrak{osp}(k|2)$ is a type II basic classical Lie superalgebra (See [11]).

The category of $\mathfrak{g}$-supermodules is described in [3] but we give a brief definition. Let $U(\mathfrak{g})$ be the universal enveloping superalgebra. The objects in the aforementioned category are all left $U(\mathfrak{g})$-modules which are $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded vector spaces $M = M_{\bar{0}} \oplus M_{\bar{1}}$ satisfying $U(g)_r M_s \subseteq M_{r+s}$ for all r, $s \in \mathbb{Z}_2$. However, in this paper, we only consider the full subcategory of all finite-dimensional $\mathfrak{g}$-supermodules. Note that these are completely reducible over $\mathfrak{g}_{\bar{0}}$ since $\mathfrak{g}_{\bar{0}}$ is semisimple and hence this aligns with the work done in [3] and [16]. For simplicity, we will from now on use the term "module" with the understanding that the prefix "super" is implicit.

2.2. **Complexity.** (See [3, Section 2.2].)
Let $\{V_t \,|\, t \in \mathbb{N}\} = \{V_\bullet\}$ be a sequence of finite-dimensional $\mathbb{C}$-vector spaces. The rate of growth of $V_\bullet$, $r(V_\bullet)$, is the smallest nonnegative integer c such that there exists a constant $C > 0$ with $\dim V_t \leq C \cdot t^{c-1}$ for all t. If no such integer exists then $V_\bullet$ is said to have infinite rate of growth.

Let $M \in \mathcal{F}$ and $\mathbf{P}_\cdot \twoheadrightarrow M$ be a minimal projective resolution of M. The *complexity* of M is defined to be $c_{\mathcal{F}}(M) := r(\mathbf{P}_\cdot)$. It was shown in [4, Theorem 2.5.1] that the complexity is always finite, in particular, $c_{\mathcal{F}}(M) \leq \dim \mathfrak{g}_{\bar{1}}$. In addition, one can use the rate of growth of extension groups in $\mathcal{F}$ to compute the complexity (See [4, Proposition 2.8.1]):

$$c_{\mathcal{F}}(M) = r\Big(\operatorname{Ext}^\bullet_{(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{g}_{\bar{0}})}(M, \bigoplus S^{\dim P(S)}) \Big), \tag{2.2.1}$$

where the sum is over all the simple modules $S \in \mathcal{F}$, and $P(S)$ is the projective cover of S. Here and elsewhere, we write $\operatorname{Ext}^\bullet_{(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{g}_{\bar{0}})}(M, N)$ for the relative cohomology for the pair $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}_{\bar{0}})$ as introduced in [5, Section 2.3].

In this paper, this characterization of the complexity will not be used in computations. However, it shows that the complexity of a module is not a categorical invariant.

2.3. **z-complexity.** (See [3, Section 9].)
The above problem of invariance can be fixed by removing the dimensions of the projective covers from (2.2.1). This will be denoted by the z-complexity as in [3, Section 9]. Thus *z-complexity* of M is

$$z_{\mathcal{F}}(M) := r\Big(\operatorname{Ext}^\bullet_{(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{g}_{\bar{0}})}(M, \bigoplus S) \Big), \tag{2.3.1}$$

where the direct sum runs over all simple modules $S \in \mathcal{F}$. Unlike complexity, $z_{\mathcal{F}}(-)$ has the advantage of being invariant under category equivalences.

Once again, (2.3.1) will not be used for the purpose of computing the z-complexity. However, if $\mathbf{P}_\cdot \twoheadrightarrow M$ is a minimal projective resolution of M, define $s(\mathbf{P}_\cdot)$ to be the rate of growth of the number of indecomposable summands at each step in the resolution. Then we can see that $z_{\mathcal{F}}(M) = s(\mathbf{P}_\cdot)$.

2.4. **Support and associated varieties.** (See [5, Section 6], [7, Section 2].)
The complexity will be interpreted geometrically using support and associated varieties. The z-complexity will be interpreted geometrically via support varities only. We provide brief introductions to these varieties.

Let $R = H^\bullet(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}_{\bar{0}}; \mathbb{C})$ be the cohomology ring of $\mathfrak{g}$ and let $M \in \mathcal{F}$. According to [5, Theorem 2.7], $\mathrm{Ext}^\bullet_{\mathcal{F}}(M, M)$ is a finitely generated R-module. Set $J := Ann_R(\mathrm{Ext}^\bullet_{\mathcal{F}}(M, M))$. The *support variety* of M is defined by

$$\mathcal{V}_{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}_{\bar{0}})}(M) := MaxSpec(R/J).$$

Now let $\mathcal{X}$ be the cone of odd self-commuting elements, that is, $\mathcal{X} = \{x \in \mathfrak{g}_{\bar{1}} \mid [x, x] = 0\}$. If $M \in \mathcal{F}$, then Duflo and Serganova [7] defined an *associated variety* of M which is equivalent to:

$$\mathcal{X}_M = \{x \in \mathcal{X} \mid M \text{ is not projective as a } U(\langle x \rangle)\text{-module}\} \cup \{0\},$$

where $U(\langle x \rangle)$ denotes the enveloping algebra of the Lie superalgebra generated by x.

2.5. **Lie superalgebra $\mathfrak{osp}(k|2)$.** We denote by $\mathfrak{g}$ the orthosymplectic Lie superalgebra $\mathfrak{osp}(k|2)$ where $k > 2$. The matrix form of these Lie superalgebras is given in [11]. Note that when $k = 2$, $\mathfrak{g}$ is the type I Lie superalgebra $\mathfrak{osp}(2|2)$ of type C which was handled in [16]. If $k = 2m$, we have the Lie superalgebra $D(m, 1)$ where $\mathfrak{g}_{\bar{0}} \cong \mathfrak{so}(k) \oplus \mathfrak{sl}_2$ is of type $D_m \oplus A_1$. If $k = 2m + 1$ we have the Lie superalgebra $B(m, 1)$ where $\mathfrak{g}_{\bar{0}} \cong \mathfrak{so}(k) \oplus \mathfrak{sl}_2$ is of type $B_m \oplus A_1$. In both cases, $\mathfrak{g}_{\bar{1}}$ is isomorphic, as a $\mathfrak{g}_{\bar{0}}$-module, to the outer tensor product of the natural representations of $\mathfrak{so}(k)$ and $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ and thus $\dim \mathfrak{g}_{\bar{1}} = 2k$.

The Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}$ will be chosen to be the set of diagonal matrices. Let $\mathfrak{h}^*$ denote the dual of the Cartan subalgebra with basis $\{\delta, \epsilon_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq m\}$. It has a bilinear form defined by

$$(\delta, \delta) = -1, \quad (\delta, \varepsilon_i) = 0, \quad (\varepsilon_i, \varepsilon_j) = \delta_{i,j} \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq i, j \leq m. \tag{2.5.1}$$

The set of simple roots is given by:

$$\Delta = \begin{cases} \{\delta - \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_{m-1} + \varepsilon_m, \varepsilon_i - \varepsilon_{i+1}, \mid 1 \leq i \leq m-1\} & \text{if } k = 2m, \\ \{\delta - \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_m, \varepsilon_i - \varepsilon_{i+1}, \mid 1 \leq i \leq m-1\} & \text{if } k = 2m+1. \end{cases} \tag{2.5.2}$$

Let Φ^+ be the set of positive roots. The set of positive even and odd roots are given respectively:

$$\Phi^+_{\bar{0}} = \{2\delta, \varepsilon_i \pm \varepsilon_j \mid 1 \leq i \neq j \leq m\},\ \Phi^+_{\bar{1}} = \{\delta \pm \varepsilon_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq m\} \quad \text{if } k = 2m, \tag{2.5.3}$$

$$\Phi^+_{\bar{0}} = \{2\delta, \varepsilon_i, \varepsilon_i \pm \varepsilon_j \mid 1 \leq i \neq j \leq m\},\ \Phi^+_{\bar{1}} = \{\delta, \delta \pm \varepsilon_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq m\} \quad \text{if } k = 2m+1. \tag{2.5.4}$$

For $\alpha \in \Phi^+$, we let e_α and $e_{-\alpha}$ to be respectively the positive and negative root vectors as defined in [17, Section 2]. Let $\mathfrak{g}_{\pm 2} = \mathbb{C}e_{\pm 2\delta}$, $\mathfrak{g}_{\pm 1}$ be the $\mathbb{C}$-span of $\{e_{\pm\alpha} \mid \alpha \in \Phi^+_{\bar{1}}\}$, and $\mathfrak{g}_0 = \mathfrak{so}(k) \oplus \mathbb{C}$ whose set of positive roots is $\Phi^+_0 = \Phi^+_{\bar{0}} \setminus \{2\delta\}$. We then have $\mathfrak{g} = \bigoplus_{i=-2}^{i=2} \mathfrak{g}_i$ as a $\mathbb{Z}_2$-consistent $\mathbb{Z}$-graded Lie superalgebra such that $\mathfrak{g}_{\bar{0}} = \mathfrak{g}_{-2} \oplus \mathfrak{g}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_2$ and $\mathfrak{g}_{\bar{1}} = \mathfrak{g}_{-1} \oplus \mathfrak{g}_1$. This shows that $\mathfrak{g}$ is a type II Lie superalgebra.

A weight $\lambda = \lambda_0\delta + \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i \varepsilon_i \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ will be written as $(\lambda_0 | \lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_m)$ where λ_i will be called the *i-th coordinate of* λ. Let $\rho = \rho_{\bar{0}} - \rho_{\bar{1}}$ where $\rho_{\bar{0}}$ is half the sum of positive even roots and $\rho_{\bar{1}}$ is half the sum of positive odd roots. Let $s = 1$ if $k = 2m$ and $s = \frac{1}{2}$ if $k = 2m + 1$. Then by [17, equation 2.1], we have:

$$\rho = (s-m | m-s, \ldots, 1-s), \quad \rho_{\bar{1}} = (m+1-s | 0, \ldots, 0), \quad \rho_{\bar{0}} = (1 | m-s, \ldots, 1-s). \tag{2.5.5}$$

In many occasions throughout this paper, we will use the following notation for a ρ-translated weight:

$$\tilde{\lambda} = \lambda + \rho = (\tilde{\lambda}_0|\tilde{\lambda}_1, \dots, \tilde{\lambda}_m).$$

Let W_0 be the Weyl group of $\mathfrak{g}_0$. In particular, W_0 is the Weyl group of $\mathfrak{so}(m)$ and hence it is a semi-direct product of the symmetric group S_m and m-copies of $\mathbb{Z}_2$ which acts on a weight λ by permuting the coordinates and also changing their signs (the number of sign changes must be in $2s\mathbb{Z}_+$). The Weyl group of $\mathfrak{g}$ is $W := W_0 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ where the nontrivial element of $\mathbb{Z}_2$ changes the sign of the coordinate λ_0 when acting on a weight λ. The Weyl group acts on $\mathfrak{h}^*$ by the *dot action*: $w \cdot \lambda = w(\lambda + \rho) - \rho$ for $w \in W$ and $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$. Since $\rho_{\bar{1}}$ is W_0-invariant, then $w \cdot \lambda = w(\lambda + \rho_{\bar{0}}) - \rho_{\bar{0}}$ for $w \in W_0$.

Integral dominant weights are described in [17]. A weight $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ is:

- *integral* if $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ or $\lambda_i \in s + \mathbb{Z}$,
- *regular* if it is integral and $|\tilde{\lambda}_1|, \dots, |\tilde{\lambda}_m|$ are distinct,
- *integral $\mathfrak{g}_0$-dominant* if it is integral and: $\lambda_1 \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_{m-1} \geq |\lambda_m|$ and further, $\lambda_m \geq 0$ *if* $k = 2m + 1$,
- *integral $\mathfrak{g}$-dominant* if it is integral $\mathfrak{g}_0$-dominant and: $l = \lambda_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, and if $0 \leq l \leq m - 1$, then $\lambda_{l+1} = \lambda_{l+2} = \cdots = \lambda_m = 0$.

Denote by P^{0+} and P^+ the sets of integral $\mathfrak{g}_0$-dominant and $\mathfrak{g}$-dominant weights respectively. For $\lambda \in P^{0+}$, the finite-dimensional irreducible $\mathfrak{g}_0$-module of highest weight λ will be denoted by L^0_λ. We can then extend it to a $\mathfrak{g}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_2$-module by making $(\mathfrak{g}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_2)L^0_\lambda = 0$. Then the generalised Verma module V_λ (as defined in [17]) is the induced module

$$V_\lambda = \mathrm{Ind}^{\mathfrak{g}}_{\mathfrak{g}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_2} L^0_\lambda \cong U(\mathfrak{g}_{-1} \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{-2}) \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} L^0_\lambda.$$

Denote by $L(\lambda)$ the unique irreducible quotient module of V_λ. It was shown in [11] that $\dim L(\lambda) < \infty$ if and only if $\lambda \in P^+$.

2.6. **Atypicality.** One of the important tools in studying representations of Lie superalgebras is atypicality. For a full definition, we refer the reader to [6, Subsection 7.2]. However, we give the definition in case of $\mathfrak{osp}(k|2)$. A weight $\lambda \in P^{0+}$ is atypical with atypical root $\gamma = \delta \pm \epsilon_l$ if $\tilde{\lambda}_0 = \pm\tilde{\lambda}_l$ for some $1 \leq l \leq m$. In this case, we define the atypicality of λ, $\mathrm{atyp}(\lambda)$, to be one. Otherwise, it is called typical with $atyp(\lambda) = 0$.

We say a simple $\mathfrak{g}$-module $L(\lambda)$ of highest weight λ is atypical (typical) if λ is atypical (typical). Thus we define $\mathrm{atyp}(L(\lambda)) := \mathrm{atyp}(\lambda)$. It is known that the atypicality is the same for all simple modules in a given block. Hence it makes sense to refer to the atypicality of a block.

Moreover, if $P(\lambda)$ is the projective cover of $L(\lambda)$, then by [12, Theorem 1] we know that $P(\lambda) = L(\lambda)$ if $\mathrm{atyp}(\lambda) = 0$, hence $L(\lambda)$ has zero complexity and z-complexity. This means that we only need to compute the complexity and z-complexity of atypical simple modules.

Remark 2.6.1. *In case $\tilde{\lambda}_0 = \tilde{\lambda}_l = 0$ (this can only happen when $k = 2m$), both roots $\gamma_\pm = \delta \pm \epsilon_l$ are atypical roots of λ. In this case, we always choose $\gamma = \delta - \epsilon_l$.*

If $\lambda \in P^{0+}$ is atypical then $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ for all i. Define the atypical type of λ by $\bar{\lambda} = (|\tilde{\lambda}_1|, \dots, |\tilde{\lambda}_{l-1}|, |\tilde{\lambda}_{l+1}|, \dots, |\tilde{\lambda}_m|)$. We will also make use of the following set $S(\bar{\lambda}) = \{|\tilde{\lambda}_i| : i \neq 0, l\}$.

2.7. **Tools.** The description of the projective covers of the simple modules given in [18] utilizes the notation developed in [17]. In the following, we recall how this notation is developed. First, we note that every regular weight $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ is W_0-conjugate under the dot action to a unique integral $\mathfrak{g}_0$-dominant weight, which will be denoted by λ^+. For a weight $\lambda \in P^{0+}$ with atypical type $\bar{\lambda}$ and atypical root $\gamma = \delta \pm \epsilon_l$, the authors in [17] defined $\lambda\hat{}$ and $\lambda\check{}$ using the following procedure. The first step is to find the smallest positive integers $a_\pm$ such that $|\tilde{\lambda}_l \pm a_\pm| \notin S(\lambda)$ if $\gamma = \delta + \varepsilon_l$ and $|\tilde{\lambda}_l \mp a_\pm| \notin S(\lambda)$ if $\gamma = \delta - \varepsilon_l$. Then

$$\lambda\hat{} = (\lambda + a_+\gamma)^+ \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda\check{} = (\lambda - a_-\gamma)^+. \tag{2.7.1}$$

A couple of examples are given in [17] to show how to compute $\lambda\hat{}$ and $\lambda\check{}$. In the following, a few more notations are recalled from [17]. We assume that $\bar{\lambda}$ is a fixed atypical type such that its coordinates $\tilde{\lambda}_1, \ldots, \tilde{\lambda}_m$ satisfy $|\tilde{\lambda}_1| > \cdots > |\tilde{\lambda}_{m-1}| \geq 0$.

Definition 2.7.1. *(See* [17, Definition 2.9]*)*

Let j be the smallest non-negative integer such that $a := j + 1 - s \notin S(\bar{\lambda})$. We define $\lambda^{(0)}$ by

$$\widetilde{\lambda^{(0)}} = \lambda^{(0)} + \rho = (-a|\tilde{\lambda}_1, \tilde{\lambda}_2, \ldots, \tilde{\lambda}_{m-1-j}, a, \tilde{\lambda}_{m+1-j}, \ldots, \tilde{\lambda}_m),$$

where we have re-labeled $\tilde{\lambda}_{m-j}, \ldots, \tilde{\lambda}_{m-1}$ by $\tilde{\lambda}_{m+1-j}, \ldots, \tilde{\lambda}_m$.

We will also utilize the weights $\lambda^{(i)}$ for $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ which are defined as follows:

Definition 2.7.2. *(See* [17, Definition 2.9]*)*

If $k = 2m+1$ or $k = 2m$ with $0 \in S(\lambda)$, define $\lambda^{(i)}$ ($i \geq 1$) inductively by:

$$\lambda^{(i)} = \left(\lambda^{(i-1)}\right)\hat{} \quad \lambda^{(-i)} = \left(\lambda^{(1-i)}\right)\check{}.$$

We compute these weights for the weight $\lambda = (0|0, \ldots, 0)$:

Lemma 2.7.3. *Let $\lambda = (0|0, \ldots, 0)$, then $\lambda^{(0)} = \lambda$. For $i \geq 1$:*

(1) *For $k = 2m$, $\lambda^{(i)} = (2m + i - 3|i - 1, 0, \ldots, 0) \quad \lambda^{(-i)} = (-i|i, 0, \ldots, 0)$.*

(2) *For $k = 2m+1$, $\lambda^{(i)} = (2m + i - 2|i - 1, 0, \ldots, 0) \quad \lambda^{(-i)} = (-i|i, 0, \ldots, 0)$.*

Proof. Consider the case $k = 2m$. The atypical type of λ is $S(\bar{\lambda}) = \{m-2, m-3, \ldots, 1, 0\}$. To compute $\lambda\hat{}$ we use $\gamma = \delta - \varepsilon_1$, $a_+ = 2m-2$, and the Weyl group element, ω, that changes the signs of the first and the last coordinates ($i = 1, m$). Then

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda\hat{} &= \omega \cdot (m-1| - m + 1, m-2, \ldots, 1, 0) - (1-m|m-1, m-2, \ldots, 1, 0) \\ &= (2m-2|0, \ldots, 0).\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we use $a_- = 1$ to find $\lambda\check{} = (-1|1, 0, \ldots, 0)$. Since $a = j = m-1$ (in definition 2.7.1), we have $\lambda^{(0)} = \lambda$. Thus, $\lambda^{(1)} = \lambda\hat{}$ and $\lambda^{(-1)} = \lambda\check{}$. An inductive approach can prove the result for $i \geq 1$ by using $a_+ = a_- = 1$. When $k = 2m+1$, we use $j = m-1$ and $a = m - 1/2$ to show that $\lambda^{(0)} = \lambda$. To find $\lambda^{(\pm 1)}$, we use $a_+ = 2m-1$ and $a_- = 1$. For $\lambda^{(\pm i)}$ ($i \geq 1$), we use $a_+ = a_- = 1$. $\square$

2.8. **Blocks.** It was shown in [9] that every atypical block in $\mathcal{F}$ for $\mathfrak{osp}(k|2)$ is equivalent to an atypical block in $\mathfrak{osp}(3|2)$ if k is odd, or $\mathfrak{osp}(4|2)$ or $\mathfrak{osp}(2|2)$ if k is even. As stated in [18, Lemma 11.1], if $k = 2m+1$ the quiver diagram of the block $\mathcal{F}_\chi$, for χ an atypical central character, is equal to the Dynkin diagram of type D_∞. However if $k = 2m$, the quiver diagram of $\mathcal{F}_\chi$ is either equal to the Dynkin diagram of type D_∞ or of type A_∞^∞. Moreover, by [18, Lemma 11.2], if the quiver diagram of $\mathcal{F}_\chi$ is of type D_∞, the integral dominant weights corresponding to $\mathcal{F}_\chi$ are $\{\lambda^{(0)}, \lambda^{(1)}, \lambda^{(2)}, \lambda^{(3)}, \dots\}$. However, if the quiver diagram of $\mathcal{F}_\chi$ is of type A_∞^∞, the integral dominant weights corresponding to $\mathcal{F}_\chi$ are $\{\lambda_-^{(0)} = \lambda_+^{(0)}, \lambda_\pm^{(1)}, \lambda_\pm^{(2)}, \dots\}$. These weights are defined in [17] and will only be used slightly in this paper and hence we omit their definitions.

In the following we combined [18, Lemma 11.2] and [18, Proposition 11.3] to get a description of the radical structure of the projective covers.

Lemma 2.8.1. *If λ is in a block F_χ with a quiver diagram of type D_∞, the projective indecomposable modules $P(\lambda^{(i)})$ ($i = 0, 1, 2$ and $i \geq 3$) have the following respective radical layer structure:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} L(\lambda^{(0)}) & L(\lambda^{(1)}) & \\ L(\lambda^{(2)}) & L(\lambda^{(2)}) & \\ L(\lambda^{(0)}) & L(\lambda^{(1)}) & \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} & L(\lambda^{(2)}) & \\ L(\lambda^{(0)}) & L(\lambda^{(1)}) & L(\lambda^{(3)}) \\ & L(\lambda^{(2)}) & \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} & L(\lambda^{(i)}) & \\ L(\lambda^{(i-1)}) & & L(\lambda^{(i+1)}) \\ & L(\lambda^{(i)}) & \end{array} \quad (i \geq 3).$$

If λ is in a block F_χ with a quiver diagram of type A_∞^∞, the projective indecomposable modules $P(\lambda_+^{(0)})$ and $P(\lambda_\pm^{(i)})$ ($i \geq 1$) have the following respective radical layer structure:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & L(\lambda_+^{(0)}) & \\ L(\lambda_+^{(1)}) & & L(\lambda_-^{(1)}) \\ & L(\lambda_+^{(0)}) & \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} & L(\lambda_\pm^{(i)}) & \\ L(\lambda_\pm^{(i-1)}) & & L(\lambda_\pm^{(i+1)}) \\ & L(\lambda_\pm^{(i)}) & \end{array} \quad (i \geq 1).$$

3. Computing the complexity

In this section we compute the complexity of atypical simple $\mathfrak{osp}(k|2)$-modules. Recall that typical simple modules over $\mathfrak{osp}(k|2)$ have zero complexity since they are projective. The key idea is to compute the complexity of the trivial module and utilize [14, Theorem 4.1.1] to find the complexity of other atypical simple modules. To perform these computations for the trivial module, we first find certain bounds on the dimension of the simple $\mathfrak{so}(k)$-module $L(r, 0, \dots, 0)$.

Lemma 3.0.2. *There are positive constants C and C' that depend only on k such that*

$$Cr^l \leq \dim L(r, 0, \dots, 0) \leq C' r^l,$$

where

$$l = \begin{cases} 2m-2 & \text{if } k = 2m, \\ 2m-1 & \text{if } k = 2m+1. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Consider the case $k = 2m$. Let $\rho_{\mathfrak{so}(k)}$ be half the sum of the positive roots $\Phi^+_{\mathfrak{so}(k)}$ in $\mathfrak{so}(k)$, then $\rho_{\mathfrak{so}(k)} = (m-1, m-2, \ldots, 2, 1)$. By the Weyl-dimension formula ([10, Section 24.3]) we have:

$$\dim L(r, 0, \ldots, 0) = \frac{\prod_{j=2}^{m}(r+j-1)(2m+r-j-1)\prod_{1<i<j\leq m}(j-i)(2m-i-j)}{\prod_{\alpha\in\Phi^+_{\mathfrak{so}(k)}}(\rho_{\mathfrak{so}(k)}, \alpha)},$$

thus

$$\dim L(r, 0, \ldots, 0) = C_1 \cdot \prod_{j=2}^{m}(r+j-1)(2m+r-j-1)$$

where C_1 is a constant that depends only on m (and hence only on k). Then $\dim L(r, 0, \ldots, 0)$ is a polynomial in r of degree $2m-2$ with a positive leading coefficient. In fact, since $2 \leq j \leq m$, we get

$$C_1(r+1)^{m-1}(m+r+1)^{m-1} \leq \dim L(r, 0, \ldots, 0) \leq C_1(m+r-1)^{m-1}(2m+r-3)^{m-1},$$

which can be used to show

$$C \cdot r^{2m-2} \leq \dim L(r, 0, \ldots, 0) \leq C' \cdot r^{2m-2},$$

where C and C' are positive constants depending only on k. The proof is similar when $k = 2m+1$. □

Theorem 3.0.3. *For $\lambda \in P^+$, $c_{\mathcal{F}}(L(\lambda)) = k+1$.*

Proof. First, let $k = 2m$. we will find the complexity of the trivial (atypical) module $\mathbb{C} = L(0|0, \ldots, 0)$. The weight $\lambda = (0|0, \ldots, 0)$ is in the block with a quiver diagram of type D_∞. The projective covers in Lemma 2.8.1 have the same structure as those over $\mathfrak{osp}(3|2)$ (see [8, Theorem 2.1.1]), hence we use the same minimal projective resolution of $L(0|0, \ldots, 0)$ from [16, Theorem 6.5.1]. It is given by:

$$\cdots \to P_d \to \cdots \to P_0 = P(\lambda^{(0)}) \to \mathbb{C} \to 0, \tag{3.0.1}$$

where the dth term, $d \geq 1$, in this resolution is given by:

$$P_d = \begin{cases} P(\lambda^{(d+1)}) \oplus P(\lambda^{(d-1)}) \oplus \cdots \oplus P(\lambda^{(2)}) & \text{if } d \text{ is odd,} \\ P(\lambda^{(d+1)}) \oplus P(\lambda^{(d-1)}) \oplus \cdots \oplus P(\lambda^{(3)}) \oplus P(\lambda^{(0)}) & \text{if } d \equiv 0 \mod 4, \\ P(\lambda^{(d+1)}) \oplus P(\lambda^{(d-1)}) \oplus \cdots \oplus P(\lambda^{(3)}) \oplus P(\lambda^{(1)}) & \text{if } d \equiv 2 \mod 4. \end{cases}$$

By using Lemma 2.7.3, a simple $\mathfrak{g}_{\bar{0}}$-module with weight $\lambda^{(i)}$ is of the form: $V(2m+i-3) \boxtimes L(i-1, 0, \ldots, 0)$ where the first module is the $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-module of dimension $2m+i-2$ and the second one is the $\mathfrak{so}(m)$-module whose dimension is bounded by Lemma 3.0.2. Thus for $i \geq 1$,

$$C(2m+i-2) \cdot i^{2m-2} \leq \dim V(2m+i-3) \boxtimes L(i, 0, \ldots, 0) \leq C'(2m+i-2) \cdot i^{2m-2}.$$

As a $\mathfrak{g}_{\bar{0}}$-module, the simple $\mathfrak{g}$-module $L(\mu)$ contains a simple $\mathfrak{g}_{\bar{0}}$-module $L_{\bar{0}}(\mu)$ as a composition factor. Using the discussion in [3, Subsection 5.1], we have the following bounds:

$$\dim L_{\bar{0}}(\mu) \leq \dim P(\mu) \leq 2^{\dim \mathfrak{g}_{\bar{1}}} \cdot \dim L_{\bar{0}}(\mu), \tag{3.0.2}$$

thus for $i \geq 1$,

$$C(2m+i-2)i^{2m-2} \leq \dim P(\lambda^{(i)}) \leq C' \cdot 2^{\dim \mathfrak{g}_{\bar{1}}}(2m+i-2)i^{2m-2}. \tag{3.0.3}$$

which can be rewritten as:

$$C_1 \cdot i^{2m-1} \leq \dim P(\lambda^{(i)}) \leq C_2 \cdot i^{2m-1}, \tag{3.0.4}$$

for some constants C_1 and C_2 that depend only on k. By adding the dimensions in each term P_d in the resolution, we can find constants K_1 and K_2 depending only on k such that

$$K_1 \cdot d^{2m} \leq \dim P_d \leq K_2 \cdot d^{2m}, \quad (d \geq 1).$$

Hence the complexity of the trivial module is $2m+1$. By [14, Theorem 4.1.1], all simple modules of the same atypicality have the same complexity. Thus the complexity of all atypical simple $\mathfrak{osp}(2m|2)$-modules is $2m+1$.

Similarly, we find the complexity of the trivial module in case $k = 2m+1$. Since $(0|0,\ldots,0)$ is in the block with a quiver diagram of type D_∞, the same proof shows that the complexity of the trivial module over $\mathfrak{osp}(2m+1|2)$ is $2m+2$. The result then follows for all the atypical simple $\mathfrak{osp}(2m+1|2)$-modules using [14, Theorem 4.1.1]. □

Next, we give the complexity a geometric interpretation as discussed earlier. We first recall the following result on support varieties:

Proposition 3.0.4. [14, Corollary 4.4.2] *For $\lambda \in P^+$, $\dim \mathcal{V}_{(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{g}_{\bar{0}})}(L(\lambda)) = \operatorname{atyp}(\lambda)$.*

In the following, we find the dimension of the associated variety of the simple modules:

Proposition 3.0.5. *For $\lambda \in P^+$, $\dim \mathcal{X}_{L(\lambda)} = \begin{cases} k & \text{if } \operatorname{atyp}(\lambda) = 1, \\ 0 & \text{if } \operatorname{atyp}(\lambda) = 0. \end{cases}$*

Proof. When λ is typical, $L(\lambda)$ is projective, hence $\dim \mathcal{X}_{X(\lambda)} = 0$ by [7, Theorem 3.4]. For the rest of the proof, assume λ is atypical. [15, Corollary 2.5] implies that $\mathcal{X}_{L(\lambda)} = \mathcal{X}$ when λ is atypical. In $\mathfrak{osp}(k|2)$, $\mathcal{X}$ has two irreducible components each with dimension equals to $\dfrac{\dim \mathfrak{g}_{\bar{1}}}{2}$, thus $\dim \mathcal{X}_{L(\lambda)} = k$ (see [7, Corollary 4.8, 4.9]). □

Combining the computations from Theorem 3.0.3 and Propositions 3.0.4 and 3.0.5, we conclude that:

Theorem 3.0.6. *For $\lambda \in P^+$, $c_{\mathcal{F}}(L(\lambda)) = \dim \mathcal{X}_{L(\lambda)} + \dim \mathcal{V}_{(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{g}_{\bar{0}})}(L(\lambda))$.*

4. Computing the z-complexity

We compute the z-complexity (cf. Subsection 2.3) of the simple modules. If λ is typical, the simple module $L(\lambda)$ is projective and we can easily show that $z_{\mathcal{F}}(L(\lambda)) = 0$.

Theorem 4.0.7. *If λ is an atypical weight in P^+, then $z_{\mathcal{F}}(L(\lambda)) = 2$.*

Proof. From Lemma 2.8.1 we observed that the projective covers of simple modules in the atypical block with quiver diagram of type D_∞ have the same radical structure as those over $\mathfrak{osp}(3|2)$ ([8, Theorem 2.1.1]). Since the z-complexity is a categorical invariant, we can

use [16, Theorem 6.7.1] to show that the z-complexity of the simple modules in that block is 2.

On the other hand, the projective covers of simple modules in the atypical block with quiver diagram of type A_∞^∞ have the same radical structure (a diamond-shape) as those over $\mathfrak{osp}(2|2)$. Thus we can use [16, Theorem 5.1.1] to show that the z-complexity of the simple modules in that block is 2. □

Next, we give a geometric interpretation of the z-complexity using support varieties relative to a detecting Lie subsuperalgebra. As defined in [5], let $\mathfrak{f}_{\bar{1}} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}_{\bar{1}}$ be the span of the root vectors e_α, f_α where $\alpha = \delta - \varepsilon_1$. Set $\mathfrak{f}_{\bar{0}} = [\mathfrak{f}_{\bar{1}}, \mathfrak{f}_{\bar{1}}]$ spanned by $[e_\alpha, f_\alpha]$. We define a three-dimensional subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ by

$$\mathfrak{f} := \mathfrak{f}_{\bar{0}} \oplus \mathfrak{f}_{\bar{1}}.$$

The Lie superalgebra $\mathfrak{f}$ is classical and so has a support variety theory. Furthermore, as $[\mathfrak{f}_{\bar{0}}, \mathfrak{f}_{\bar{1}}] = 0$, it follows that these varieties admit a rank variety description and, in particular, can be identified as subvarieties of $\mathfrak{f}_{\bar{1}}$, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{V}_{(\mathfrak{f},\mathfrak{f}_{\bar{0}})}(M) = \mathcal{V}^{rank}_{\mathfrak{f}_{\bar{1}}}(M) = \{y \in \mathfrak{f}_{\bar{1}} \mid M \text{ is not projective as } U(\langle y \rangle)\text{-module}\} \cup \{0\}.$$

Using this detecting subsuperalgebra, we have the following geometric interpretation of the z-complexity:

Theorem 4.0.8. *If $L(\lambda)$ is a simple module over $\mathfrak{osp}(k|2)$, then*

$$\dim \mathcal{V}_{(\mathfrak{f},\mathfrak{f}_{\bar{0}})}(L(\lambda)) = z_{\mathcal{F}}(L(\lambda)).$$

Proof. By [14, Theorem 4.1.1], any atypical simple module $L(\lambda)$ satisfies

$$\mathcal{V}_{(\mathfrak{f},\mathfrak{f}_{\bar{0}})}(L(\lambda)) = \mathcal{V}_{(\mathfrak{f},\mathfrak{f}_{\bar{0}})}(\mathbb{C})$$

since $L(\lambda)$ and $\mathbb{C}$ have the same atypicality. We have, however, $\mathcal{V}_{(\mathfrak{f},\mathfrak{f}_{\bar{0}})}(\mathbb{C}) = \mathfrak{f}_{\bar{1}}$ which gives $\dim \mathcal{V}_{(\mathfrak{f},\mathfrak{f}_{\bar{0}})}(\mathbb{C}) = 2$. Thus,

$$\dim \mathcal{V}_{(\mathfrak{f},\mathfrak{f}_{\bar{0}})}(L(\lambda)) = z_{\mathcal{F}}(L(\lambda)) = 2.$$

Now, if $L(\lambda)$ is typical, then it is projective and hence, $\dim \mathcal{V}_{(\mathfrak{f},\mathfrak{f}_{\bar{0}})}(L(\lambda)) = z_{\mathcal{F}}(L(\lambda)) = 0$. □

References

[1] J. L. Alperin, Periodicity in groups, *Illinois J. Math*, **21**, 1977, no. 4,776-783.

[2] J. Carlson, The varieties and the cohomology ring of a module, *Journal of Algebra*, 85, no. 1 (1985), 104-43.

[3] B. D. Boe, J. R. Kujawa, and D. K. Nakano, Complexity for modules over the classical Lie superalgebra $\mathfrak{gl}(m|n)$, *Compositio Mathematica*, **148**, 2012, 1561-1592.

[4] ——, Complexity and module varieties for classical Lie superalgebras, *Int. Math. Res. Not.*, 2011, Issue 3, 696-724.

[5] ——, Cohomology and support varieties for Lie superalgebras, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **362**, 2010, no. 12, 6551-6590.

[6] ——, Cohomology and support varieties for Lie superalgebras II, *Proc. London Math. Soc.*, **98** 2009, no. 1, 19-44.

[7] M. Duflo and V. Serganova, On associated variety for Lie superalgebras, 2005, arXiv:math/0507198.

[8] J. Germoni, Indecomposable representations of $\mathfrak{osp}(3,2)$, $D(2,1;\alpha)$ and $G(3)$, *Colloquium on Homology and Representation Theory* (Spanish) (Vaqueras, 1998) *Bol. Acad. Nac. Cienc.*, Crdoba, Argentina **65**, 2000, 147-163.

[9] C. Gruson and V. Serganova, Cohomology of generalized supergrassmannians and character formulae for basic classical Lie superalgebras, *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc.* (3) 101, 2010, no. 3, 852-892.
[10] J. E. Humphreys, Introduction to Lie algebras and representation theory, *Springer* (1972).
[11] V. Kac, Lie superalgebras, *Adv. Math.* **26**, 1977, 8-96.
[12] V. Kac, Representations of classical Lie superalgebras, *Lecture Notes in Math.*, **676**, Springer Verlag, 1977, 597-626.
[13] V. Kac and M. Wakimoto, Integrable highest weight modules over affine superalgebras and number theory, *Progr. Math.*, **123**, Birkhauser, Boston, Boston, MA, 1994, 415-456.
[14] J. Kujawa, The generalized Kac-Wakimoto conjecture and support varieties for the Lie superalgebra $\mathfrak{osp}(2|2n)$, *SE Lie Theory Conf. Proc., Proc. Symp. Pure Math.*, Volume 86, 2012.
[15] V. Serganova, On superdimension of an irreducible representation of a basic classical Lie superalgebra, *Supersymmetry in Mathematics and Physics,* Springer, Heidelberg, 2011, 253-273.
[16] H. El Turkey, Complexity of modules over classical Lie superalgebras, *Journal of Algebra*, **445** (2016), 365–393.
[17] Y. Su and R. B. Zhang, Generalised Verma modules for the orthosymplectic Lie superalgebra $\mathfrak{osp}_{K|2}$, *Journal of Algebra*, **357**, 94-115 (2012).
[18] K. Coulembier, Bott-Borel-Weil theory, BGG reciprocity and twisting functions for Lie superalgebras, *arXiv:1404.1416*.

Department of Mathematics and Physics, University of New Haven, 300 Boston Post Road, West Haven, CT 06516
E-mail address: helturkey@newhaven.edu